UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/585,747	06/02/2000	Smaragda Hadjinikitas	Syner-161XX	7128

207   7590   02/23/2005

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN, GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP
TEN POST OFFICE SQUARE
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER
DINH, MINH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*10 December 2004*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *9-11* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 12-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>*02 June 2000*</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the RCE filed 12/10/2004. Claims 1 and 4-8 have

been amended; claims 9-11 have been canceled; claims 12-24 have been added.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 and 8 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3.   Applicant's arguments, see the last paragraph of page 11, filed 12/10/2004, with

respect to the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered

and are persuasive. The rejection of claim 5 has been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

4.   Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: "to authenticated"

(line 8) should be changed to "to authenticate". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6.   Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the

invention. Claims 12 and 14 are directed to a method and system for authentication in a

distributed environment comprising requesting a service at a first data processing agent

by a user, authenticating the user at a second data processing agent and, upon

successful authentication, transmitting authentication information including the user's

name and password to the first data processing agent for authenticating subsequent

requests from the user. Authentication information such as passwords is sensitive

information and needs to be protected when being transmitted between data processing

agents. Without such a protection, passwords can be accessed by unauthorized

person(s). However, the specification fails to convey any information about protection

of passwords. Thus, the disclosure fails to enable one skilled in the art to make and use

the claimed invention.

7.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8.   Claims 5-7, 16-20, 8 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 5, it recites the limitation "the first timeout period" in the last line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The limitation is interpreted as "the first timeout value" (see line 9). Similar problems are found in lines 15 of claim 8, 6-7 of claim 21.

Regarding claim 22, it recites the limitation "the second predetermined period" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The limitation is interpreted as "the second time period" (see lines 9-10).

Claims that are not specifically addressed are rejected by virtue of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claim 1-4, 8, 13, 15, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al (6,226,752) in view of Moriconi et al. (6,158,010).

Regarding claims 1 and 4 (claim 1 being exemplary), Gupta discloses a method of authenticating a user of a client computer at a server computer, comprising the steps of: receiving a service request from the user at a first data processing agent (col. 11, line 45 – col. 12, line 6); submitting an authentication request from the first data

processing agent to a second data processing agent to authenticate the user (col. 12,

lines 13-23); receiving a response to the authentication request at the first data

processing agent from the second data processing agent, wherein if the user is

successfully authenticated, the response includes authentication information that the

first data processing agent can use to authenticate a subsequent user service request

without submitting a subsequent authentication request to the second data processing

agent (col. 12, lines 24-52; col. 13, lines 19-26); and if the received response indicates

that the user is successfully authenticated, providing the requested service to the user

(col. 12, line 62 – col. 13, line 18). Gupta does not disclose that the data processing

agents are on the same server. Moriconi et al. disclose that two data processing agents

are implemented on the same server (col. 10, line 64 – col. 11, line 6). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

modify the method of Gupta such that the first and second data processing agents are

implemented on the same server, as taught by Moriconi, in order to provide maximum

performance and minimize network traffic overhead.

Regarding claim 2, Gupta does not disclose that the received response includes

a level of access privileges for the user, and the providing step includes the step of

determining the service provided to the user based upon the user's access privilege

level. Moriconi discloses a level of access privileges for a user (col. 7, lines 41-41) and

the step of determining the service provided to the user based upon the user's access

privilege level (col. 8, lines 25-28, col. 13, lines 18-23). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the method of

Gupta such that the received response includes a level of access privileges for the user, and the providing step includes the step of determining the service provided to the user based upon the user's access privilege level, as taught by Moriconi. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide service to authorized users only.

Regarding claim 3, Gupta further discloses that the first data processing agent is included in an application server and the second data processing agent is included in a login server (see fig. 2).

Regarding claim 8, Gupta discloses a system for authenticating a user comprises a first server including a first data processing agent for receiving a service request from the user (col. 11, line 45 – col. 12, line 6); a second server including second data processing agent for authenticating the user (col. 12, lines 13-23), wherein the first data processing agent is configured to submit an authentication request to the second data processing agent to authenticate the user (col. 12, lines 13-23), wherein the second data processing agent is configured to receive the authentication request, attempt to authenticate the user, store a first timeout value indicative of a first predetermined period if the user is authenticated and determine if the first predetermined period is exceeded (col. 12, lines 24-43; col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 4), wherein the first data processing agent is configured to require the user to be re-authenticated at the second data processing agent upon receipt of a second service request if the first predetermined period is exceeded before the second service request is received (col. 14, lines 8-11).

Gupta does not explicitly disclose that the first data processing agent is configured to notify the second data processing agent if a second service request is received from the user and the second data processing agent is configured to restart the first timeout period in response to receiving the notification. However, these features are deemed to be inherent to the Gupta system as lines 19-23 of col. 13 show that the second data processing agent does not have knowledge of subsequent requests from the user, and yet, the second data processing agent monitors the first predetermined period (col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 4). The Gupta system would be inoperative if the first data processing agent was not configured to notify the second data processing agent if a second service request is received from the user and the second data processing agent was not configured to restart the first timeout period in response to receiving the notification.

Gupta does not disclose that the first and second data processing agents are on the same server. Moriconi et al. disclose that a first and second data processing agents are implemented on the same server (col. 10, line 64-col. 11, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made modify the method of Gupta such that the first and second data processing agents are implemented on the same server, as taught by Moricono, in order to provide maximum performance and minimize network traffic overhead.

Gupta does not disclose a plurality of first data processing agents at the same server. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that having a plurality of first data processing agents at the same server is well known in the art. It would have been

obvious at the time of the invention was made to have a plurality of first data processing agents at the same server since Examiner takes Official Notice that having a plurality of first data processing agents at the same server so that different services can be accessed from one server is well known in the art.

Regarding claims 13 and 15, Gupta further discloses storing the received authentication information on the first data processing agent; receiving a second service request from the user at the first data processing agent; and using the stored authentication information to authenticate the user without submitting a subsequent authentication request to the second data processing agent (col. 13, lines 19-26).

Regarding claim 21, Gupta further discloses storing a second timeout value indicative of a second time period if the user is authenticated; and if the first data processing agent receives the second service request before the second timeout period is exceeded, restart the second timeout period and provide the requested service to the user without requiring the user to be authenticated at the second data processing agent (col. 11, line 45 – col. 12, line 6; col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 11).

Regarding claim 22, Gupta further discloses that the first data processing agent still needs to refer to the first predetermined time period maintained at the second data processing agent in order to make a decision whether to terminate a session although the second time period is maintained at the first data processing agent (col. 14, lines 4-11). This suggests that the two timeout values are not the same and that the second timeout value is less than the first timeout value.

11.   Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Gupta in view of Moriconi as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view

of Purpura (6,421,768). Gupta does not disclose that authentication information

transferred between the data processing agents includes a user name and a password

associated with the user. Purpura discloses transferring authentication information

including a user name and a password associated with a user from a first server to a

second server after the user has been authenticated at the first server (col. 3, line 48-

58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the Gupta method such that that authentication

information includes a user name and a password associated with the user, as taught

by Purpura, to facilitate the second server's authentication of the user.

12.   Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Gupta in view of Moriconi as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of

Hambrecht et al (6,629,082). Gupta does not disclose that the user sets the timeout

values. Hambrecht discloses allowing users to set timeout values (col. 20, lines 4-7, 40-

44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the Gupta system such that that the user sets the timeout

values, as taught by Hambrecht, in order to accommodate user's preference.

Allowable Subject Matter

13.   Claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s)
under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

14.   The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject
matter. Claims 5-7 and 16-20 are directed to an authentication method in a distributed
environment in which a first data processing agent utilizes a second data processing
agent for authenticating a first request for service from a user received at the first data
processing agent, and the second data processing agent monitors an inactivity timeout
period associated with the user's session with the first data processing agent. More
specifically, independent claim 5 identifies the uniquely distinct feature: "if a second
request is received from the user at another of the plurality of first data processing
agents before the first time period is exceeded, restarting the first timeout period". The
closest prior art, Gupta et al, discloses an authentication method in a distributed
environment in which the first timeout period is restarted if a second request of the
same session is received; however, Gupta does not teach that the first timeout period is
restarted if a second request is received from the user at another first data processing
agent. The prior art, taken either singly or in combination, fails to anticipate or fairly
suggest the limitations of applicant's independent claim, in such a manner that a
rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 or 103 would be proper. The claimed invention is
therefore considered to be in condition for allowance as being novel and nonobvious
over prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-3802. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 10:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MD

Minh Dinh
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

MD
2/14/2005

GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100